Remarks

I. Introduction

This is in response to the final Office Action dated April 6, 2007 and is being submitted simultaneously with a Request for Continued Examination pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.114.

The Office Action rejected claims 12-15, 24-26, 28, 29, 30, 33, 34, 36, 37-40, 42, and 43 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over United States Patent No. 6,002,941 to Ablay et al. (Ablay) in view of United States Patent No. 5,991,803 to Glitho et al. (Glitho). The Office Action rejected claim 27 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ablay in view of Glitho, and further in view of United States Patent No. 6,003,031 to Harktikainen et al. (Harktikainen). The Office Action rejected claims 31 and 32 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ablay in view of Glitho, and further in view of "From SIB to Distributed Objects: A Transformation Approach for Service Creation" by Elie Najm et al. (Najm). The Office Action rejected claims 35 and 41 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ablay in view of Glitho, and further in view of United States Patent No. 6,351,646 to Jellema et al. (Jellema).

Claims 12, 24, and 30 have been amended.

Claims 12-15 and 24-43 are pending in this application.

II. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Independent claims 12 and 24 were rejected as being unpatentable over Ablay in view of Glitho. In order to "establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art." In re Royka, 490 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974). Furthermore, "all words in a claim must be considered in judging the patentability of that claim against the prior art." In re Wilson, 424 F.2d 1382, 1385, 165 USPQ 494, 496 (CCPA 1970). See also MPEP § 2143.03. Neither of the cited references, either alone or in combination, teach all of the claim limitations of independent claims

12 and 24 as amended. Therefore, Applicants request the withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

The present invention is generally directed to multimedia services creation. A service designer can access a service creation environment via a Web based graphical user interface to design a new service by assembling Language Graphical Objects (LGO) into a service logic script. As described at page 5, lines 15-20, the LGOs are interlocking building blocks, each of which represents a unique service control/call control function. As illustrated in FIGS. 1 and 6-27 and described at page 9, lines 19-21, the blocks are interlocking with varying sizes of notches and varying numbers of extending bulges, which are used to enforce rules of their connectivity. As described at page 10, lines 10-11, an executable token, which fires a block to begin execution of that block, is passed between the LGO blocks in order to cause execution of the LGO blocks. The service logic script generated by assembling the LGOs is installed in a service execution environment, and the LGO blocks are translated into programming language objects when the service logic script is installed and executed.

Independent claim 12 has been amended to more particularly claim the above described aspects of the present invention. In particular, claim 12, as amended, recites the limitation of:

> assembling <u>interlocking</u> graphical language blocks into a service logic script<u>, said graphical language blocks having varying sizes of notches and varying number of extending bulges for enforcing rules for their connectivity</u>, wherein said graphical language blocks each represent service control or call control functions and wherein each block has at least one input or output for passing a̶ <u>an executable</u> token between blocks<u>, said token causing execution of said blocks</u>.

Independent claim 24 has been amended to include a similar limitation.

Neither Ablay, nor Glitho, alone or in combination teach this limitation of independent claims 12 and 24.

Ablay is directed to using a service building block in a wireless communication system to create logic program rules. The logic program rules are provided to a service execution environment, and configurable software modules within the service execution environment are executed in accordance with the logic program rules. The service building blocks are described at column 6, lines 44-47 as "an abstract, graphical representation of a service primitive." As illustrated in FIG. 6, the service building blocks have various inputs and outputs and can be graphically manipulated using a graphical user interface. However, the service building blocks shown in FIG. 6 do not interlock. There is no description in Ablay of the service building blocks having notches and bulges of varying sizes and numbers that enforce rules of connectivity between the service building blocks. Thus, Ablay fails to disclose "assembling interlocking graphical language blocks into a service logic script, said graphical language blocks having varying sizes of notches and varying number of extending bulges for enforcing rules for their connectivity," as recited in independent claim 12. Furthermore, although Ablay describes data passing between service building blocks, Ablay does not describe the service building blocks inputting or outputting an executable token, which causes execution of the service building blocks. Thus, Ablay fails to disclose "wherein each block has at least one input or output for passing an executable token between blocks, said token causing execution of said blocks," as recited in independent claim 12.

Glitho is directed to decoupling a service creation environment from a service logic execution environment. As described therein, a service creation environment generates generic service creation information defining a service. The generic service creation information is then mapped into service creation information that is specific to the service logic execution environment. Although Glitho describes a limited number of service building blocks being utilized by the service creation environment (column 4, lines 17-21), there is no description in

Glitho a graphically represented service building blocks, let alone interlocking service building blocks having notches and bulges of varying sizes and numbers that enforce rules of connectivity. Furthermore, Glitho does not describe the service building blocks inputting or outputting an executable token that causes execution of the service building blocks. Thus, Glitho fails to disclose "assembling interlocking graphical language blocks into a service logic script, said graphical language blocks having varying sizes of notches and varying number of extending bulges for enforcing rules for their connectivity, wherein said graphical language blocks each represent service control or call control functions and wherein each block has at least one input or output for passing an executable token between blocks, said token causing execution of said blocks," as recited in independent claim 12.

Thus, for the reasons discussed above, independent claim 12 is allowable over the cited art. For similar reasons, independent claim 24 is also allowable over the prior art. Since claims 13-15 and 25-43 depend from allowable independent claims 12 and 24, claims 13-15 and 25-43 are also allowable.

III. No New Matter

No new matter has been added since the all of the amendments to the claims are supported in the specification, drawings or claims, as filed.

The amendments to claims 12 and 24 are supported at least at page 9, lines 18-23, and page 10, lines 6-11, of the specification.

IV. Conclusion

For the reasons discussed above, all pending claims are allowable over the cited art. Reconsideration and allowance of all claims is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Steven M. DiPasquo
Reg. No. 54,754
Attorney for Applicant
Tel.: 973-533-1616

Date: August 6, 2007
AT&T Corp
Room 2A-207
One AT&T Way
Bedminster, NJ 07921